



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/737,396

12/15/2003

Gary R. Bledsoe

61513/84290

8896

20873

7590

10/13/2006

LOCKE LIDDELL & SAPP LLP

ATTN: DOCKETING DEPT.

2200 ROSS AVENUE

SUITE 2200

DALLAS, TX 75201-6776

EXAMINER

MOHANDESI, JILA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3728

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/737,396

Applicant(s)

BLEDSOE, GARY R.

Examiner

Jila M. Mohandesi

Art Unit

3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-34 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-34 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/25/03 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-14, 18-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crispin (4,771,768) in view of Powell et al. (5,887,591). Crispin '768 discloses a device for treatment of foot comprising: a boot comprising a shell (U-shaped shell with side walls 40 and 42), a sole (slip resistant sole 44) on the bottom of said shell and a footplate (rigid foot supporting interior surface 46) on top of said shell; two uprights (metal uprights 54 and 56) connected to said shell; a cuff (flexible breathable foam padded upper portion 22) to secure said boot to said foot; wherein said sole has a bottom shaped to allow a near normal walking gait; and wherein said foot plate places said foot in an amount of dorsiflexion. See Figures 1-4 embodiments. Crispin '768 does not appear to disclose wedges placed on said footplate to increase the amount of

dorsiflexion and a heel strap. Powell '591 discloses a device for treatment of plantar fasciitis by increasing the amount of dorsiflexion using a variety of wedges (lifting members 100) having different sizes and angles that can be used interchangeably on the footplate during treatment. The angles range from about 10 degrees to about 30 degrees. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a variety of wedges to the device of Crispin '768 as taught by Powell '591 to better treat plantar fasciitis by increasing the amount of dorsiflexion without changing the angle between the sole and the at least one upright.

All the functional claim language and statements of intended use (a device to increase dorsiflexion of the foot) do not make an otherwise unpatentable claim patentable. It is believed to be well settled that "recitation with respect to manner in which claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate claimed apparatus from prior art apparatus satisfying structural limitations of that claimed," *Ex parte Masham* 2 USPQ2nd 1674. Also *Ex parte Casey* 152 USPQ 235. The law of anticipation does not require that an anticipatory reference teach what the applicant is claiming or has disclosed, but only that the claims "read on" something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in the reference. See *Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed Cir. 1983). Furthermore, it is only necessary that the reference include structure capable of performing the recited function in order to meet the functional limitations of a claim. See *In re Mott*, 557 F.2d 266, 194 USPQ 305 (CCPA 1977). Since the reference device has all of the same structural elements, as noted above, it would clearly seem to be inherently capable of

performing the functions as claimed. Furthermore, the product packaging of Grosskopf '866 can inherently be used as a food product package.

With respect to claim 4, note leg straps (104, 106 & 108).

With respect to claims 7 and 24 whether the securement means is hook and loop or adhesive or any other art recognized equivalent is an obvious matter of choice, such as cost and ease of manufacturing.

With respect to claims 9 and 25, Powell '591 discloses a heel strap to better secure the device to the leg of the wearer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a heel strap to the device of Crispin '768 as taught by Powell '591 for a better securement of the device to the leg of the wearer.

With respect to the angle of dorsiflexion, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify and adjust the angle of dorsiflexion, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

With respect to claims 27-28, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

The method claims 30-34 and 36 are submitted to read on those steps inherent in the use of Crispin '768 device as modified.

4. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crispin '768.

With respect to claims 15-16, it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments, see remarks of pages 12 and 13, filed 08-01-06, with respect to Bledsoe Publication have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-13, 18-34 and 36 has been withdrawn.

However Applicant's arguments filed 08/01/06 with respect to Crispin patent has been fully considered but is not persuasive. All the functional claim language and statements of intended use (a device to increase dorsiflexion of the foot) do not make an otherwise unpatentable claim patentable. It is believed to be well settled that "recitation with respect to manner in which claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate claimed apparatus from prior art apparatus satisfying structural limitations of that claimed," *Ex parte Masham* 2 USPQ2nd 1674. Also *Ex parte Casey* 152 USPQ 235. The law of anticipation does not require that an anticipatory reference teach what the applicant is claiming or has disclosed, but only that the claims "read on" something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in the reference. See *Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed Cir. 1983). Furthermore, it is only necessary that the reference include structure capable of performing the recited function in order to meet the functional limitations of a

claim. See *In re Mott*, 557 F.2d 266, 194 USPQ 305 (CCPA 1977). Since the reference device has all of the same structural elements, as noted above, it would clearly seem to be inherently capable of performing the functions as claimed. Furthermore, the product packaging of Grosskopf '866 can inherently be used as a food product package.

6. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

### ***Conclusion***


7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jila M. Mohandesi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4558. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-4:00 (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Jila M Mohandesi  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3728

JMM  
October 05, 2006